SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

21st Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXI, No. 16 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © October 15, 1991

Director's Recusal Ordered Terminated

NIH Goes on Grappling With the Misconduct Issue

"It's getting to be more and more like a Marx Brothers movie," a closely involved senior official told SGR last week in connection with the latest turnabout in the policing of scientific misconduct by the National Institutes of Health.

The plot this time centers on an order from above "terminating" NIH Director Bernadine Healy's self-decreed recusal from all matters concerning the NIH Office of Scientific Integrity (OSI). Thus, under orders, she is back in the misconduct "loop," as they say, after announcing hands-off at a Congressional hearing on August 1.

At the same time, the inspiration for the recusal, a lingering misconduct case from Healy's former place of employment, the Cleveland Clinic, was transferred, uncompleted, from OSI to the next level up in the misconduct hierarchy, the Office of Scientific Integrity Review. OSIR comes under the Assistant Secretary of Health in NIH's parent agency, the Department of Health and Human Services, and normally receives cases only after the NIH-based OSI has investigated them and produced findings and recommendations.

The end of the recusal was ordered by Assistant Secretary of Health James O. Mason in a letter to Healy dated October 3. Noting that he had been told that OSI's investigation of the Cleveland case would take "six to seven more months," Mason stated:

"This length of time is too long for you to be recused from duties involving the OSI. During this period, a number of important scientific integrity issues will need to be addressed within the PHS [Public Health Service, administrative umbrella of NIH and other health agencies], and I want the benefit of input from the Director, NIH, on these issues." Mason added that the dis-recusing was effective immediately, and NIH says Healy complied at once.

Jules Hallum, Director of OSI, told SGR in an interview on September 24 that the Cleveland case would be wound up in "several months." NIH sources now tell SGR that the extension to "six to seven more months" arises from the decision to appoint a new panel of expert advisers on the case to replace an inhouse NIH panel. The inhouse panel, OSI has decided, was inappropriate while the Director of NIH was under recusal.

In his letter to Healy, Assistant Secretary Mason didn't identify the "important scientific integrity issues" on which he wants her advice. But currently marking time on the OSI agenda are highly publicized cases involving Nobelist David Baltimore and NIH's own Robert Gallo. In addition, a revised version of OSI's basic regulations, currently under consideration, is the object of an orchestrated protest campaign by the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology. Over 2000 suspiciously similar letters of criticism of the proposed regulations have arrived so far at the Department of Health and Human Services.

Healy's now-cancelled recusal originated in a miscon-

(Continued on Page 2)

NSF Elevates Social Sciences—P. 4
US Science Attaches Abroad—P. 6

In Brief

After being "zeroed-out" by a House Appropriations Subcommittee as unaffordable, the Space Station has made a triumphant comeback, thanks to an all-out lobbying campaign, with the full amount requested by the Administration, $2.02 billion, endorsed by both chambers. But other NASA programs suffered major damage in the process, including elimination of the agency's role in the ambitious National Aerospace Plane project. The $67 million requested was cut to $5 million "to maintain a small NASA presence" in the joint NASA-DOD venture. Still to be decided is whether the financially strapped Pentagon will foot the bill.

Does the Soviet Mir *space station have a future role in the US program? There's been talk of the possibility, but an analysis by the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service expresses serious doubts. The existing* Mir, *it states, is underpowered for US needs, while other alternatives would probably be better in terms of cost-effectiveness as a substitute for the Space Station.*

Under the title "War Without Risk: Faith in Technology and the Lessons of Vietnam," a major exhibition is in preparation at the National Air and Space Museum. Focused on "issues of technology and doctrine," it's described as "among the first major museum exhibitions to examine the American experience in Vietnam." The scheduled opening date is May 1993.

The Department of Education has awarded the National Academy of Sciences $500,000 "to coordinate the development of science education standards," according to an NAS announcement.

. . . Clash With Dingell Over Cleveland Clinic Case

(Continued from Page 1)

duct inquiry that she headed in 1990 while serving as Director of research at the Cleveland Clinic. At issue was an NIH grant application in which a Clinic staff member engaged in "anticipatory writing," defined as reporting data that were expected but not yet in hand. The Cleveland inquiry panel headed by Healy concluded that misrepresentation could not be proven, but it reprimanded the scientist for sloppiness.

Healy later explained that she reopened the Cleveland case after she learned that a member of the inquiry panel was a co-investigator of the accused application writer. Critical of Cleveland's handling of the case, OSI took it up and was conducting an investigation when Healy arrived last April as Director of NIH. She immediately recused herself from the Cleveland case, while otherwise retaining authority over OSI.

Within months of taking office, Healy conspicuously blasted OSI's operational techniques, accusing the office of disregard for due process and the rights of the accused. The word around NIH was that the new Director wanted OSI "reined in." Healy said she was especially incensed by leaks of OSI's draft report in the so-called Baltimore case. The report concluded that data had been fabricated by Thereza Imanishi-Kari, of Tufts University, and that her co-author, David Baltimore, had failed to respond to plausible complaints about the paper.

The draft report's warm praise for the "whistle-blower" in the case, Margot O'Toole, a former postdoctoral fellow in Imanishi-Kari's laboratory, focused Healy's ire on the author of the report, Suzanne Hadley, former Acting and Deputy Director of OSI. Hadley had left OSI for another assignment at NIH prior to Healy coming aboard as NIH Director, but Hadley had agreed to complete the investigations and reports on three cases, Baltimore, Gallo, and Cleveland.

Director Healy was increasingly unhappy with OSI and Hadley's status as a parttime investigator for the office. Early last summer, the Bethesda grapevine reported Healy on the warpath against OSI. Aroused by reports that OSI investigator Hadley had developed a close relationship with whistle-blower O'Toole in the Baltimore case, the NIH Director ordered an examination of Hadley's telephone logs. Hadley protested what she rightly regarded as a slur on her integrity, and resigned her remaining connections with OSI.

At which point, the patron saint of whistle-blowers, Rep. John Dingell, easily conjured up a vision of outrageous scandal. Though never stated in so many words, the Dingell vision amounted to NIH chief Healy retaliating against OSI and Hadley for their criticism of Healy's performance in the Cleveland case. With OSI in shambles, Healy ordered a management review of its operations. And on July 19, she also quietly recused herself from all OSI matters.

On August 1, Healy, in a combative mood, faced Dingell and several equally irate Congressional colleagues at a hearing probably unrivaled for acerbity in Capitol Hill's long history of relations with the scientific community. SGR's on-deadline report of that collision [August 1: "NIH Director Defends Curbs on Misconduct Office"] sought to convey the general flavor of the proceedings. But some of the finer points, left out in the telling for lack of space, merit attention. They are presented here from the official transcript, as yet unpublished.

Healy scornfully explained her recusal from all OSI affairs by noting that "on July 19th, 1991, a theory was put forth by the staff of this Subcommittee never heard by me before: that the very existence of an open Cleveland Clinic case might influence my dealings with OSI on other matters. However preposterous that was," she asserted, "I removed myself immediately from the chain of command of OSI until the case was resolved." And describing her role in the Cleveland inquiry, she ridiculed suggestions that she had not been forthcoming in regard to the case. "I would challenge this committee to ask, where is the cover-up?"

But the Dingell Subcommittee had its questions lined up and wasn't going to be put off pace by Healy's insistence that the Cleveland case and her dislike of OSI were in all respects unrelated. The members chose to go over the Cleveland episode step by step, leaving behind a trail of innuendos of grave misdeeds.

Badgered at the hearing by Rep. Norman Lent (R-NY) for signing the "anticipatory" grant application in her role as research director at the Cleveland Clinic, Healy responded that her signature merely signified the availability of facilities and resources. Lent insisted that her signature should mean more than that, suggesting that she should have challenged the "anticipatory" data in the application. Healy responded that she couldn't be expected to certify the accuracy of data in all grant applications, and returned to the theme of facilities and resources.

Telling the Congressman that "scientists don't do re-

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1991, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

European Correspondent
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $358.00 (two years, $610.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . Legal Sharks Are Circling on Due Process Issue

(Continued from Page 2)

search in their backyards in a tent," she declared: " Scientists do research in institutions, and that means a major commitment of space, of resources, of equipment. I sign to assure that those institutional assurances are there."

Lent turned to Dingell. "Mr. Chairman," he said with exasperation, "I can't handle this witness. I am getting unresponsive replies to my questions."

Dingell took up the questioning, telling Healy, "I am just a poor, foolish lawyer from Detroit and I get a little befuddled in some of these difficult questions."

"I am just a poor girl from New York," Healy replied.

Persisting, Dingell noted that Healy and the grant applicant had signed the NIH application form.

Dingell. He signed second and you signed first.

Healy. Who's on third?

Dingell. I am just trying to understand this.

Healy. I am trying to understand your concern, Mr. Dingell, and I am afraid that I don't.

At another point in the hearing, Healy was discussing the threat of a lawsuit by the whistle-blower in the Cleveland Clinic case when Dingell interrupted her.

Healy. This is very important. Could I finish this, please?

Dingell. Let us interpret the law.

Healy. Could I finish my statement?

Dingell. No, let us just—

Healy. I am not interpreting the law. I am telling you what happened. You asked me about what happened in our treatment of the whistle-blower. Could I finish?

Dingell. I think I have the answer that I want.

Healy. No, I don't think you have, because I haven't said it.

Also testifying at the hearing was Assistant Secretary of Health Mason, who had his own fire fights with the Congressmen. Indignantly accusing Dingell and others of implying that Director Healy was under investigation for misconduct, Mason declared, "I really resent the assumptions that have been brought forth in this hearing and by the inquisitors that called upon me"—a reference to a prehearing meeting several days earlier with members of Dingell's staff, from which Mason stormed out, exclaiming that they were "weirdos."

Dingell. For your information, Doctor, there have been no inquisitors calling upon you. It has been staff investigators calling upon you.

Mason. Is that what they were?

Chairman Dingell then indulged in one of his standard hearing-room tactics—a recitation of pertinent provisions from US criminal statutes.

Dingell. I wonder if you have objections to us seeing to it whether you are properly enforcing the law. . .

Mason. I have no objections.

Dingell. I am curious if you have any objections to the questions or the tenor of the proceedings today.

Mason. Yes, I do.

Dingell. I would like to hear you set it out, because you seem to have some strong feelings. Let's just have at it, and air it out.

Mason. I resent the assumptions that have been brought up. . . .

Dingell. What are the allegations and the assumptions that you resent?

Mason. You know them clearly. . . . They have been handled all day today.

Dingell. You tell us. You tell us. You are the man that has been saying that there are assumptions here. I want you to set them out. You are recognized for that purpose. You either say them or you don't say them, and we will let the record say what you have said.

Mason. I think you have strongly suggested—

Dingell [interrupting]. I haven't suggested a damn thing.

Mason. Well, then I don't know what you have been doing.

Dingell. I asked questions.

Mason. I have heard today that Dr. Healy has been a target of an investigation at Cleveland Clinic.

Dingell. No, we have never made the statement that Dr. Healy—

Mason [interrupting]. That clarifies it for me. I am glad to hear that.

Dingell. We have inquired as to whether or not she was a target and whether or not she was in fact advised that she was a target or not.

Mason. I think you have clarified it for me by your statement.

The hearing ended soon after.

NIH will eventually disentangle itself from this mess and get things right with its procedures for dealing with scientific misconduct. But several more difficult episodes are likely to occur before smooth and confident operations become the norm. In one court case, NIH came away unscathed on the issue of whether its misconduct regulations accord due process to the accused, but that decision applies in only one federal court district in Wisconsin. Counsel for several scientists caught in the OSI net think other judicial views might prevail on the due process issue. In any event, the weight of sentiment within the scientific community appears to be in conflict with OSI's regulations and the strongly expressed opinions of Director Hallum.

Healy hasn't spoken out on OSI matters since the lifting of her recusal, but previously she was in the vanguard of critics of OSI procedures, particularly on due process. What does it mean for cases already settled and those in the pipeline if the existing rules are deemed unfair and replaced by new ones? At the very least, it means new adventures in the saga of NIH and the management of misconduct.—DSG

NSF Gives Social Sciences Their Own Directorate

In the venerable Washington quest for a name on the door if not on the building, the social and behavioral sciences achieved victory last week in their protracted campaign for an enclave of their own at the National Science Foundation. Director Walter Massey announced the achievement along with several other organizational shifts at the Foundation, including the creation of an Office of Planning and Assessment to gauge the effectiveness of NSF's big programs.

To the lineup of disciplinary directorates at NSF, until now seven in all, will be added the Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences—SBE in NSF-ese. The new Directorate is to be extracted from the backroom of its longtime home, the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences, leaving the old shop simply titled the Directorate for Biological Sciences.

Behind the change is the discreetly whispered hope that visibility will bring more money to the social and behavioral sciences, which have never been permitted more than limited access to the NSF trough, the main source of support for academic research in these fields. In an overall NSF budget of $2.4 billion last year, about $70 million was allotted to a broad cluster of activities under the heading of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NSF, now in its 41st year, was created by physical scientists to serve as their bank in Washington. Most of them looked upon the social and behavioral sciences as intellectually soft imitations of their brand of science. The founders are long gone, but their attitudes have receded very slowly.

Along with the creation of SBE, Massey announced the long-expected "disestablishment" of the Directorate for Scientific, Technological and International Affairs (STIA), a catchall collection whose various functions will be dispersed to other parts of NSF. Prominent among them is STIA's Division of Science Resources Studies, now convalescing from a long bout of internecine combat. The Division is to be incorporated into the SBE, as is STIA's Division of International Programs, increasingly important as the US seeks research ties abroad for purposes of friendship and stretching a skimpy purse.

STIA's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR), a system of hush money for states that fare poorly in competition for NSF grants, will be transferred to the Directorate for Education and Human Resources. The STIA Business Innovation Research Program goes to the Engineering Directorate.

In a memorandum to last week's meeting of NSF's board, Massey touched on a fear that's a standard backdrop in relations between the federal government and the social and behavioral sciences. He noted that "even those who appreciate the soundness of intellectual arguments in support of the new directorate express concern for the potential political vulnerability of social science research subjects . . . "

The reference to "political vulnerability" arises from past conflicts that NSF has had over its support for social-science projects that aroused Congressional ire, particularly that of now-retired Senator William Proxmire. Whether because of an ideologically well-scrubbed research agenda, good luck, or whatever, NSF has been free of political flareups in recent years. But not so the National Institutes of Health, which, under the gun of right wingers in the parent Department of Health and Human Services, has cancelled two surveys on sexual behavior over the past six months.

Asked at a press briefing about the risks of political intrusions into the social-science agenda, Massey merely said that NSF relies on peer review for selecting its projects.

Massey's memo to the National Science Board reflected arguments that have long been raised in behalf of the new SBE Directorate. Citing the report of a Task Force created last year to evaluate proposals to split up the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Massey noted that new technologies have expanded the reach of scientific research, and that the biology was sufficient for a Directorate all its own.

The new Office of Planning and Assessment, which will house the Division of Policy Research and Analysis, will not look at the outcome of individual project grants, Massey said. Rather, he explained, it will be concerned with the larger NSF ventures, such as the various programs of interdisciplinary research centers at universities.

Massey, who took office in February, was asked why NSF was now doing a turnabout on the social and behavioral sciences. The difference, he said, is that "the Director has changed." His predecessor, Erich Bloch, tended to be cool about a separate operation for the social and behavioral sciences, but did set up the Task Force whose recommendations led to the creation of the new Directorate.

Steady lobbying and working on Congressional friends also helped bring about the change. In the vanguard were the Washington-based Consortium of Social Science Associations, which represents the major social-science professional societies, and the American Psychological Society, a splitoff of researchers from the practitioner-dominated American Psychological Association.

Also in the picture is Washington's growing uncertainty and failure of confidence about America's ability to cope with its economic and social problems. The erosion of federal support for statistical services and societal research under the Reagan Administration has to some extent been repaired. But increasingly there is a sense in the capital that existing conditions are poorly understood and policy options are dimly illuminated. NSF is not expected to remedy the situation. But the importance of a thriving academic base in these fields is understood in the White House and Congress.

Greater prominence for the social and behavioral sciences might have evoked some notice, favorable or otherwise, in Washington in earlier times. But Massey's announcement received virtually no attention outside the science press.—DSG

In Quotes: NASA the "Political Football of '90s"

From an address by Rep. George E. Brown Jr. (D-Calif.), Chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, to the National Space Club, in Washington, September 24.

•

When one reviews the growth in the NASA budget over the past five years, it has been quite remarkable. Since 1987, the budget for NASA [$16 billion in fiscal 1992] has increased by over 50 percent in real terms. NASA has fared much better than any other federal agency. This is partially, or perhaps even mainly, due to the current Administration's priority for the space program. I personally agree with this priority and have fought to defend it, but it has become a mixed blessing for NASA.

There is no question that NASA has become the political football of the 90s, just as Defense was in the 80s. This has become painfully evident with the budget agreement that Congress and the Administration put in place last year. This agreement took Defense off the table [by specifying budget levels through 1993] and in doing so created some major problems which Congress is only now beginning to fully grasp.

For example, in forcing Congress to work within a framework of completely irrational choices, it has institutionalized a problem that has always been with us to one degree or another. How many viewers of the debate that took place over the [Space] Station this summer really understand why we have to trade Veterans and Homeless programs for Space? I am a 25-year Member of Congress and I don't understand it.

One of several more rational choices is Defense for Space. Here we are dealing with much the same industrial base, many of the same technologies, the same facilities, and so on. If we are to prudently and efficiently draw down on Defense, as is the intent of the budget agreement, we must offer some way of applying some of these dollars to uses that will maintain our national technological strength. . . .

It is useful to look at the long-term trends in programs aimed at investment and growth. These include such things as environmental programs, transportation, education, and research and development. Overall, the aggregate of these expenditures shows a disturbing trend. As a percentage of GNP, investment has fallen from 3.5 percent in 1980 to a little over 2 percent in 1990. . . .

This overall trend and the reasons for it have become an annual debate when we receive the President's budget each year. Within this category, funding for research and development, however, has clearly shown a dramatic increase since about 1985, and in no way fits the broad pattern of disinvestment for which this Administration has been criticized.

Thus, I find it disturbing that many in Congress berate the Administration for their lack of commitment to investment on the one hand, and on the other hand criticize them for the only specific area in which we are doing well.

The Augustine Committee recommended that we set and agree on a steady 10 percent rate of growth for the space program . . . However, I am also mindful that a 10 percent real growth simply cannot be promised in this budget climate. I believe, however, that a 5 percent real growth is not only reasonable, it is entirely achievable.

I know that it is easy to look at the terms of the budget agreement and forecast a fairly gloomy picture for growth in anything and everything over the next several years, including the space program. However, there is no doubt that the budget agreement will be renegotiated shortly. . . . I am confident that space will continue to emerge as a priority and be recognized as such within the political process that drives the budget.

Administration Accused of Fast Shuffle on "New" Fellowships

A Congressman with a sharp eye for budgetary sleight of hand has chastised the White House Science Office and the President for whooping up a new NSF program, called Presidential Teaching Fellows, designed to encourage young faculty members to stay in teaching. What they did not mention, Rep. Howard Wolpe (D-Mich.) points out, is that the program will be financed by reducing the number of awards in NSF's Presidential Young Investigators Program, established in 1982 to encourage young researchers to stay in research.

In a letter dated September 30 to Presidential Science Adviser D. Allan Bromley, Wolpe noted that the 30 announced Faculty Fellowships, of approximately $100,000 per year for five years, will take approximately 50 grants from the Young Investigators program, which currently makes about 200 awards of $50,000 a year for five years.

Wolpe, who chairs the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, observed that Bromley announced the new program at a meeting of the American Association of Engineering Societies, while the President touted it in a well-publicized Rose Garden talk.

Neither of them, Wolpe stated in his letter, explained that this is "a reprogramming of funds that will actually reduce the total number of Presidential grants to promising young academicians." The letter has gone unanswered.

US Science Attaches Abroad—Names and Posts

The Science Counselors and Attaches posted at US embassies and missions around the world are a little-known resource for ferreting out information and making contacts in their areas. So, from time to time (last on June 15, 1989), SGR lists them but, again, with cautionary notes. They generally rank low in the diplomatic hierarchy and possess little influence with the ambassadors they serve under. But they're often well-connected to the research establishments in the country or region where they serve. They don't like to be regarded as tour guides or travel agents. If they choose, they can be extremely helpful in making connections with local researchers and in providing information about research institutions and collaborative programs. At posts not assigned a science specialist, the task is usually handled by another office, often that of the Cultural Attache.

Add American Embassy to the address given, unless Mission is indicated. *Army or Fleet Post offices (APO, FPO), recommended as the preferred routing to US diplomatic posts, are given for most addresses. The State Department furnished the following list, which it said is current as of September 13.*

•

Argentina, Buenos Aires: Paul Maxwell, APO Miami, FL 34034; tel. 1774-7611.

Brazil, Brasilia: Barbara Tobias, APO Miami FL 34030; tel. 61-223-0120.

Canada, Ottawa: Thomas Wajda, APO Ogdensburg, NY 13669; tel. 613/238-5335.

China, Beijing: Andrew Onate, APO San Francisco, CA 96655; tel. 1-52-3831.

Czechoslovakia, Prague: Rodney Huff, Box 5630, APO NY 09213-5630; tel. 42-2-536641.

European Community, US Mission, Brussels, Belgium: Anthony Rock, APO New York 09667; tel. 322-513-4450.

France, Paris: Michael Michaud, APO NY 09777; tel. 331-4206-1202.

Germany, Bonn: Frank Kinnelly, APO NY 09080; tel. 49-228-330-3390.

Hungary, Budapest: Lawrence Cohen, APO NY 09213; tel. 36-126-450.

India, New Delhi: Peter Heydemann, c/o Department of State, Washington, DC 20520; tel. 11-600-651.

Indonesia, Jakarta: Sidney Smith, APO San Francisco, CA 96356; tel. 21-360-360.

Israel, Tel Aviv: Charles Lawson, APO NY 09762; tel. 03-654-338.

Italy, Rome: Reno Harnish, APO NY 09764; tel. 6-46741.

Japan, Tokyo: Edward Malloy, APO San Francisco, CA 96503; tel. 9011-813-224-5500

Korea, Seoul: Kenneth Cohen, APO San Francisco 96301; tel. 2-732-2601.

Mexico, Paseo de la Reforma: APO Laredo, TX 78044; tel. 525-211-0042.

Organization for European Cooperation and Development, Paris, France: Daniel Dolan, APO NY 09777; tel. 1-45-24-74-31.

Poland, Warsaw: Coleman Nee, APO NY 09213; tel. 22-283041.

Spain, Madrid: Robert Morris, APO NY 09285; tel. 3411-274-3400.

Taiwan, Taipei: Matthew Matthews, #2 Chung Cheng 3rd Rd., 3d Fl., Kaohsiung, Taiwan; tel. 886-7-224-0154.

United Kingdom, London: Jeffrey Lutz, APO NY 09510; tel. 01-499-9000.

US Mission to UN, Vienna: Michael L. Von Grey, APO NY 09108; tel. 43-222-51451.

USSR, Moscow: Robert Clark, APO NY 09862; tel. 096-252-2451.

Yugoslavia, Belgrade: Thomas Hutson, APO NY 09213; tel. 11-645-655.

Job Changes & Appointments

William D. Phillips has resigned because of illness from the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), where he was the first occupant of the post of Associate Director for Industrial Technology. Appointed to succeed him: ***Eugene Wong***, formerly of UC Berkeley, who joined OSTP in April 1990 as Associate Director for Physical Sciences and Engineering. ***Karl Erb***, who had been serving under Wong, has been named to succeed him on an acting basis.

J.R. Thompson, a 25-year veteran of NASA, serving since 1989 as No. 2 in the agency, has announced his retirement, effective November 8. Also at NASA: ***William Lenoir***, Associate Administrator for Space Flight, will turn over supervision of the Space Station program to Associate Administrator ***Arnold Aldrich***, who has been named to head a new office of Space Systems Development. Lenoir is to concentrate on launches of the Space Shuttle and unmanned vehicles.

Kurt J. Isselbacher, Harvard Professor of Medicine and Director of the Cancer Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, has been appointed Chairman of a new National Research Council Committee on Risk Assessments of Hazardous Air Pollutants. The Committee, consisting of 24 members, was mandated by Congress in the 1990 amendments to the Clear Air Act to examine risk-assessment methodologies used by the Environmental Protection Agency. ***Richard D. Thomas*** is serving as Program Director. The first meeting of the Committee is scheduled for October 31-November 2, at the National Academy of Sciences, in Washington.

J. Clarence Davies, Senior Fellow at the World Wildlife Fund, will join Resources for the Future in October 1992 as Director of the RFF Center for Risk Management. Davies, former head of policy planning and evaluation at the Environmental Protection Agency, is currently Executive Director of the National Commission on the Environment, created by World Wildlife Fund to study US environmental policy.

More in Print: AIDS, Trade, NIMH, Agriculture, Bridges

(Continued from Page 8)

America Living With AIDS (165 pp., no charge), the first major report of the 15-member National Commission on AIDS, established by Congress in 1988 to prod the White House, which this report does with charges of political skittishness toward coping with the disease, lack of national planning and treatment facilities, inadequate funds, etc.

The report notes that "there is no cabinet-level coordinating group to deal with HIV, nor has a single agency been designated with responsibility for AIDS programs." Calling for an all-out campaign against the disease, it says that government "should assure access to a system of health care for all people with HIV disease."

The report does not explicitly condemn the Bush Administration's political approach to AIDS, but, in reference to the Administration's recent cancellations of sexual-behavior surveys, the report states that "some would prohibit even the study of human behaviors that put our children at risk." The Commission is chaired by June Osborn, Dean of the School of Public Health, University of Michigan.

Order from: National AIDS Clearinghouse, PO Box 6003, Rockville, Md. 20849-6003; tel. 1-800-458-5231.

International Trade: US Business Access to Certain State-of-the-Art Technology (GAO/NSIAD-91-278; 50 pp., no charge), by the General Accounting Office, says that among American high-tech companies dependent on Japanese suppliers for sophisticated parts, a substantial number reported that they sometimes got the runaround while parts were made available to Japanese competitor firms. GAO said it took these complaints to six Japanese firms and was assured that they do not favor the hometeams "in selling their state-of-the-art products." The study was requested by Senator Lloyd Bentsen (D-Texas).

Also from GAO: ***High-Performing Computing: High-Speed Computer Networks in the United States, Europe, and Japan*** (GAO/IMTEC-91-69; 46 pp., no charge), says the US leads in the development of high-speed networks for research and education, adding that "Europe and Japan face a number of financial, organizational, and other issues, which, if not addressed, could prevent the development or expansion of their network infrastructures." GAO produced the report at the request of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, both strong proponents of rapid development of a nationwide network of computer "highways."

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20877; tel. 202/275-6241.

National Institute of Mental Health Publications, (7 pp., no charge), a list of NIMH publications, under headings that include Needs Assessment and Evaluation, Mental Health National Statistics, Information Systems, and Research.

Order from: Information Resources and Inquiries Branch, NIMH, 5600 Fishers Lane, Room 15C-05, Rockville, Md. 20857; tel. 301/443-4513.

National Research Initiative of the US Department of Agriculture (91-435 SPR; 11 pp., no charge), from the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service, a review of USDA's 10-year plan for $500 million in new research money, of which $200 million would be for competitive awards to solo investigators, $150 million for interdisciplinary teams, $100 million for applied research, and $50 million for improving land-grant labs. The report, by Christine M. Matthews, notes USDA research grants lag behind those of NSF and NIH in size and duration.

Order from: Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Madison Building, Washington, DC 20540; attn. Ms. Raap; tel. 202/707-7014.

US Antarctic Program, 1991-1992: Research Projects (26 pp., no charge), summaries of projects in the NSF program. Categories are Biology and Medicine, Geology and Geophysics, Glaciology and Glacial Geology, Ocean Sciences, Climate Studies, Ozone-Depletion Studies, Astronomy and Astrophysics.

Order from: NSF, Division of Polar Programs, Room 627, attn. David Friscic, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-7817.

Bridge Aesthetics Around the World (277 pp., $55 softbound, $75 hardcover), from the Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, a study of the beauty of bridges, with striking illustrations, many in color, of outstanding examples throughout the world.

Order from (and make checks payable to): Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-3213.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please Bill
Institutional subscribers: one year, $358.00 ☐; two years, $610.00 ☐
(Foreign airmail, $35.00 per year; foreign surface $15.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970; In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054

In Print: Human Performance, Science Priorities, Etc.

The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.

In the Mind's Eye: Enhancing Human Performance (291 pp., $29.95, plus $3 shipping), a skeptical examination by a National Academy of Sciences committee of the benefits that the US Army might reap from "new age" techniques, such as "subliminal self-help," meditation, and other methods described in the report as "developed largely outside the academic research establishment."

Caution prevails throughout the report, prepared for the Army Research Institute by the NAS Committee on Techniques for the Enhancement of Human Performance, chaired by Robert A. Bjork, UCLA Department of Psychology. The report states, for example, "The assertion that the proper application of Kundalini Yoga can help develop the 'soldier-saint' in whom is instilled the desire and superhuman ability to excel in the art of war is not supported by scientific evidence."

The report is a followup to the Committee's 1988 publication, ***Enhancing Human Performance: Issues, Theories, and Techniques*** (299 pp., $32.50 hardbound, $22.50 paperbound, plus $3 shipping), which frenzied the wacko sector by asserting that "The committee finds no scientific justification from research conducted over a period of 130 years for the existence of parapsychological phenomena." The 1988 report notes that "some military decision makers" believe in this stuff.

Also from the Academy: ***A Safer Future: Reducing the Impacts of Natural Disasters*** (67 pp., $12.95, plus $3 shipping), by the US National Committee for the Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, the US participant in a UN-endorsed program to reduce the effects of earthquakes, hurricanes, droughts, etc., in the 1990s. The US Committee, chaired by Richard E. Hallgren, American Meteorological Society, recommends various measures, including public education and preparedness, changes in construction designs, risk assessments, and research.

A slickly prepared, color-illustrated promotional brief rather than a documented assessment of its subject, the report calls for closer US cooperation with bilateral and multilateral programs under the UN International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, PO Box 285, Washington, DC 20055; tel. 1-800-624-6242; in Washington, DC: 334-3313.

Science Indicators: 1991 Compendium—Quebec (84 pp., no charge), third annual edition of a model of statistical detail and political sassiness by the Canadian province of Quebec, which regularly flaunts its nation-like qualities in its squabblings about sovereignty with the rest of Canada. The report, available in English for the benefit of those unskilled in Quebec's official French, compares Quebec with both the province of Ontario and the rest of Canada in terms of government and industrial R&D spending, trained manpower, university enrollments, etc. In volume of scientific publications, it improbably states, "The number of studies produced by Canadian researchers [24,892 in 1989] is almost equal to that of their French counterparts [28,732]. The number of publications by Quebec researchers [5059] is comparable to that of researchers in Belgium [5216] and Denmark [4930]." As a scientific powerhouse, the report claims, Quebec ranks 13th among the 24 nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Order from: Direction des Politiques et des Priorites Scientifiques, Ministere de l'Enseignement Superieur et de la Science, 1000, route de l'Eglise, 5 etage, Sainte-Foy, Quebec, Canada GIV 3V9; tel. 418/643-3009.

From Congress, texts of hearings held this year on several major issues of science policy (single copies available without charge):

Establishing Priorities in Science Funding (Serial No. 3-2; 285 pp.), hearings in July, by the House Budget Committee Task Force on Defense, Foreign Policy and Space, starring skeptical Congressmen fencing with proponents of the Superconducting Super Collider and the Space Station. Joining in were several scientists who expressed doubt about the value of the big projects. In unusually blunt exchanges, the hearing illuminated the financial flim-flam and dubious claims that have long characterized the SSC and the big space venture. No matter. When voting time came in the House and Senate, both were fully funded. [The hearing, first in the science-policy area by the Budget Committee, was reported in SGR August 1: "Candor and Clashes Mark Hearing on R&D Priorities."]

Order from: House Budget Committee, Annex I, Publications Office, Room 214, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/226-7217.

The Role of Basic Research in Economic Competitiveness (No. 38; 236 pp.), from hearings in June by the Subcommittee on Science of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, with a flock of witnesses, from academe, government, and industry, grappling with the subject. Prominent among them was former NSF Director Erich Bloch, who said the US is still spending too much on defense research and on mega-projects and too little on the physical sciences that underpin much of high-tech industry.

Order from: House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Publications Office, 2320 Rayburn Building, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/225-6375.

(Continued on Page 7)